

**REMARKS**

Claims 1, 5, 8-13, 17-19 and 21-23 are pending in this application. By this Amendment, claims 1, 5 and 11 are amended, claims 21-23 are added and claims 2-4, 6-7, 14-16 and 20 are cancelled. Favorable reconsideration in view of the foregoing amendment and the following remarks is respectfully requested.

Applicants thank Examiner Merek for the courtesies extended to Applicants' representative during the August 5 telephone interview. During the interview, various distinctions were discussed to better define over the prior art of record. The distinctions are incorporated into the foregoing amendments.

**I. Formal Matters**

The Office Action rejects claims 7 and 16 under 35 U.S.C. §112, 1<sup>st</sup> paragraph, and rejects claims 4, 7, 16 and 20 under 35 U.S.C. §112, 2<sup>nd</sup> paragraph. Applicants respectfully submit that the foregoing amendments obviate these rejections. Withdrawal of these rejections is respectfully requested.

**II. The Claims Define Patentable Subject Matter**

A. Claims 1, 2, 5, 9, 11-14 and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) over U.S. Patent No. 5,586,656 to Abrums. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

As agreed during the interview, the claims are distinct from Abrums for at least the reason that they recite a plurality of attachment projections. Withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

B. The Office Action rejects claims 3, 4, 6, 7, 15, 16 and 20 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Abrums in view of U.S. Patent No. 2,695,115 to Roop. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Neither Abrums nor Roop teaches or suggests projections with an engagement surface that makes an acute angle with respect to a bottom surface of a container, such as is recited in

independent claims 1 and 11. Accordingly, claims 3, 4, 6, 7, 15, 16 and 20 are patentably distinct from Abrums in view of Roop at least for the independency on claims 1 or 11.

Withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

C. Claims 8 and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Abrums in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,423,453 to Fritz. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Neither Abrums nor Fritz teaches or suggests the "acute" feature recited in independent claims 1 and 11, and accordingly, claims 8 and 17 patentably define over Abrums in view of Fritz at least because of their dependency on claims 1 and 11, respectively. Withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

D. Claims 10 and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Abrums in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,256,026 to Andress et al. (Andress). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Neither Abrums nor Andress teaches or suggests the "acute" feature recited in independent claims 1 and 11. Accordingly, claims 10 and 19 patentably define over Abrums in view of Andress at least because of their dependence on claims 1 and 11, respectively. Withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

E. During the interview, U.S. Patent No. 5,184,745 to Havens et al. (Havens) and U.S. Patent No. 4,733,790 to Stein were discussed at length. In particular, Figs. 4-9 of Havens were discussed. To better define over the tapered projections disclosed in these Figs., claims 1 and 11 have been amended to further define the structure of the projections. Specifically, claims 1 and 11 have been amended to recite that the first attachment projections each comprise a proximal end, a distal end, a convex outer side surface, a concave inner side surface, and two end surfaces connecting the inner side surface and the outer side surface, the end surfaces of each first attachment projection being spaced from end surfaces of adjacent

first attachment projections. Claim 11 also includes other amendments for consistency with this amendment.

Neither Havens nor any of the other prior art of record discloses such a projection structure in combination with the "acute angle" feature that is also recited in claims 1 and 11. Accordingly, claims 1 and 11 are patentably distinct from the prior art of record.

F. New claim 21 depends from claims 12, and is allowable at least for its dependence on an allowable base claim.

G. New claim 22 is similar to claim 1, except that claim 22 (a) does not limit the structure of the first attachment projections, other than to specify that they form an acute angle with respect to the bottom surface, and (b) further defines the second attachment as comprising a plurality of second attachment projections that each form an acute angle with respect to the inside surface of the lid and engage with the first engagement surfaces. Claim 22 is allowable at least for the reason that none of the prior art of record discloses a plurality of acute-angled projections on an inside surface of a lid that engage with a plurality of acute-angled projections on the bottom surface of a container.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number set forth below.

Respectfully submitted,



James A. Oliff  
Registration No. 27,075

J. Adam Neff  
Registration No. 41,218

JAO:JAN/cmf

Attachment:  
Information Disclosure Statement

Date: August 14, 2003

**OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC**  
**P.O. Box 19928**  
**Alexandria, Virginia 22320**  
**Telephone: (703) 836-6400**

<p>DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE AUTHORIZATION Please grant any extension necessary for entry; Charge any fee due to our Deposit Account No. 15-0461</p>
--